

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,669	01/24/2000	Branko Kovacevic	0100.9901410	6121
34456 75	90 03/21/2003			
TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P. PO BOX 29567 AUSTIN, TX 78755-9567			EXAMINER BRITT, CYNTHIA H	
			2133	
			DATE MAILED: 03/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/489,669	KOVACEVIC ET AL.
-	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cynthia H. Britt	2133
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 11 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applion I) a timely filed amendment whith all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		,
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: This amendment removes issues that could be considered new matter but applicant has not addressed the response to arguments provided by the examiner in paper number7. Also, applicant argues that the prior art used in the previous papers do not teach enabling error detection or correction. However, the examine understands the art used in papers 5 and 7(Nuber et al.U.S. Patent No. 5,742,623, Bock et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,948,119, and Galbi U.S Patent No. 5,768,292) have error detection and correction preformed and therefore must be enabled. Therefore this application is not in condition for allowance.

Continuation of 10. Other: The amendments to the claims will be entered as they place the claims essentailly in the original condition..

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

2